

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 30 and 31 have been revised to correct clerical errors in the indicated claim dependencies. No new matter has been introduced, and entry of the above claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-33 are pending and have been restricted. The restriction alleges the presence of two Groups of claims, with Group I being claims 1-21 and 26-33 and Group II being claims 22-25.

Applicants acknowledge and thank the Examiner for recognizing that asserted Groups I and II are related as product and process of use, respectively. Applicants respectfully however, traverse because the asserted basis of the restriction is misplaced. The statement of restriction alleges that

“the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product such as a non-viral vector, naked DNA, or transfected dendritic cells.” (see page 3 of the Restriction Requirement)

Contrary to this allegation is the fact that the Group II claims do not literally encompass the “materially different products” recited in the above statement. Instead, claims 22-25 are directed to the administering of pairs of vectors as defined in claims 16, 17, 20, and 21, respectively. So how can methods for using those pairs of vectors be practiced with the “materially different” products listed above? Because this is not possible, Applicants believe that Group II is directed to the use of the products of Group I. Accordingly, no restriction is proper between the Groups, and the restriction may be properly withdrawn.

In the event that the Restriction Requirement is maintained despite the above traversal, Applicants elect Group I, claims 1-21 and 26-33 with traverse for the reasons provided above.

Applicants remind the Examiner of rejoinder practice as set forth at MPEP 812.04 upon an indication of the allowability of elected Group I. That practice would require the rejoinder of Group II to Group I.

The restriction further requires Applicants to “elect a single disclosed species”, apparently by sequence, if Group I is elected. Applicants respectfully submit that a requirement for an election of species from a genus of products must be based upon 37 C.F.R. § 1.141(a) and 1.146, both of which expressly recognize that “a reasonable number” of species may be claimed along with allowable generic claims within a single application. Applicants point out that there has been no demonstration that “more than a reasonable number of species” is encompassed by the pending claims.

Applicants therefore traverse this requirement because no more than a reasonable number of species is presented in the claims of Group I. Moreover, and as set forth at 37 C.F.R. § 1.146, requiring election of a species is discretionary and results in a restriction *only* “if no claim to the genus is found to be allowable.” Thus Applicants respectfully submit that the requirement for an election of species is for purposes of facilitating search and examination. If no prior art is found to anticipate or render obvious the elected species, Applicants respectfully submit that the search of the claims should be extended to the next species to allow for consideration of the generic claim encompassing multiple species.

Based on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the requirement for an election of species is misplaced and should be modified or withdrawn.

In the event that the requirement for election of species is maintained, Applicants elect Group I, with traverse as provided above, and the species of “SEQ ID NO:5” for the modified 5T4 antigen encoded by the vector of claim 14, with traverse. Applicants point out that

Appl. No. 10/774,176  
Amdt. dated March 22, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of February 22, 2006

PATENT

in the cases of a pair of vectors, the claims include the possible feature of both vectors encoding the same 5T4 antigen.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-5, 9-14, 16-21, and 27-33 read on the elected species, with claims 1-5, 9-13, 16-21, and 27-33 being generic to the elected species.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 858-350-6100.

Respectfully submitted,



Kawai Lau, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. 44,461

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 858-350-6100  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
Attachments  
KL:ps